DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 966 HE 023 025

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90. A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965). Commission Report 89-11. |
| INSTITUTION | California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento. |
| PUB DATE | Mar 89 |
| NOTE | 54p.; Best copy available. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985 (free). |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC03 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Faculty; Educational Finance; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Higher Education; Law Schools; *Public Colleges; *Public Policy; State Legislation; *State Universities; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Salaries |
| IDENTIFIERS | *California; California State University; University of California |

ABSTRACT

This annual report presents an analysis of faculty salaries at the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) for the 1989-90 academic year. An introductory section presents the rationale for the reports and its conclusions. Section 2, "Origins of Methods of Analysis," is concerned with the history of faculty salary reports, change in content and methodology, and the issue of law school faculty salaries. Section 3 is titled "Projected Salaries Required for Parity at California's Public Universities" (UC and CSU). It is estimated that for 1989-90, UC faculty members will require an average salary increase of 4.7% to bring them to the mean of their comparison group, and CSU salary increases of 4.81% are needed. Appended are: (1) Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session, relative to academic salaries and welfare benefits; (2) methods for calculating salary and fringe benefit comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95; (3) House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session, relative to the economic welfare of the California public institutions of higher education; (4) a recommended method for reporting to the legislature on faculty salaries and other benefits; and (5) related letters with statistics. Displays are included. Contains 5 references. (SM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED312966

# FACULTY SALARIES IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, 1989-90

| Academic Rank | 1988-8[illegible] |
|---|---|
| Professor | $68,932 |
| Associate Professor | 45,240 |
| Assistant Professor | 39,559 |
| All Ranks Averages | 59,469 |

## CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CA Postsecondary Education Commission
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



HE 023 025

# Executive Summary

Annually, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the Commission submits to the Governor and the Legislature an analysis of faculty salaries in the University of California and the California State University for the forthcoming fiscal year.

In this report for the 1989-90 year, the Commission analyzes the data submitted to the University and State University by their respective groups of comparison institutions and shows how those data are formulated into the parity percentages presented on pages 7-15. It estimates that for 1989-90, University of California faculty members will require an average salary increase of 4.7 percent to bring them to the mean of their comparison group, while California State University faculty members will require an increase of 4.81 percent.

This report includes a discussion of the issue of continued inclusion of law school faculty salaries in the salary calculations for some of the comparison institutions of the California State University, which itself has no law schools.

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting on March 6, 1989, on recommendation of its Policy Development Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

Later this summer, the commission will publish a related report that will describe faculty members' salaries at California's Community Colleges and salaries of administrators at the University of California and the California State University, as well as a report on the law school faculty salary issue for the State University.

# FACULTY SALARIES IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES 1989-90

*A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965)*

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814

**COMMISSION REPORT 89-11**
**PUBLISHED MARCH 1989**

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 89-11 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

# *Contents*


1. Summary and Conclusions 1

- Rationale for the Report 1
- Conclusions of the Report 1
- The Issue of Law School Faculty 1
- Organization of the Rest of the Report 1

2. Origins and Methods of the Analysis 3

- History of the Faculty Salary Reports 3
- Changes in Content and Methodology 3
- The Issue of Law School Faculty Salaries 5
- Other Salary Reports 6

3. Projected Salaries Required for Parity at California's Public Universities 7

- University of California 7
- The California State University 11

Appendices 17

A. Senate Concurent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session, Relative to Academic Salaries and Welfare Benefits 17

B. Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95 19

C. House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session, Relative to the Economic Welfare of the Faculties of the California Public Institutions of Higher Education 27

D. A Recommended Method for Reporting to the Legislature on Faculty Salaries and Other Benefits at the University of California and the California State Colleges 29

E. Letter to Kenneth B. O'Brien from Calvin C. Moore, December 9, 1988 39

F. Letter to Murray J. Haberman from Thierry F. Koenig, December 5, 1988 43

References 51

# *Displays*


1. University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88 6

2. University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1988-89, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1988-89 Staffing Patterns 7

3. University of California 1987-88 Salary Schedule for Nine- and Eleven-Month Faculty, with Percentage Differences 8

4. California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1982-83 9

5. California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1987-88 10

6. California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1988-89 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1988-89 Projected Salaries; State University 1987-88 Average Salaries; 1988-89 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1987-88 Staffing Patterns) 12

7. California State University 1987-88 Salary Schedule for Nine-Month and Eleven-Month Regular Faculty, with Percentage Differences 13

# 1 *Summary and Conclusions*

### Rationale for the report

Annually, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session (reproduced in Appendix A on page 17), the University of California and the California State University submit to the Commission data on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for their respective groups of comparison colleges and universities.

On the basis of these data, Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in salaries required to attain parity with the comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. The methodology requires that the Commission submit parity figures for both segments to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst by December 5 of each year and then publish its supporting analysis early in the following year. This report fulfills that obligation of the Commission for this year.

### Conclusions of the report

For this report, the University of California obtained 1988-89 salary data from all of its eight comparison institutions, while the California State University obtained data from all of its 20 comparison institutions. The Commission's methodology for computing the University's and State University's parity figures is reproduced as Appendix B on pages 19-25.

The Commission's comparison of those data with salaries of University and State University faculty reveals that both of California's public universities improved their competitive positions over the past five years -- the University moving from about sixth to fifth position on its list of eight comparison institutions, and the State University moving from about eighteenth, to between fourth and eighth in relation to its 20 comparison institutions for its three top faculty ranks -- professor, associate professor, and assistant professor.

For 1989-90, the Commission estimates that University of California faculty members will require an average salary increase of 4.7 percent to bring them to the mean of their comparison group. The University's Regents had requested a 4.6 percent increase, but that amount did not include final data for one of the University's comparison institutions.

For the State University, the Commission estimates that a salary increase of 4.81 percent is necessary to keep its faculty at the mean of its 20 comparison institutions. The State University's Trustees, following a practice instituted since the implementation of collective bargaining, and having approved a three-year contract with faculty, have in essence agreed to the 4.81 percent figure, to be effective January 1, 1990, provided it is funded in the Governor's Budget.

### The issue of law school faculty

A major issue for resolution during 1989 is the inclusion of law school faculty in preparing the State University's salary parity figure. This year's figure of 4.81 percent includes the 0.2 percent adjustment prescribed in the current methodology. On April 17 of this year, the Commission will review this issue and the recommendation of its Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology in order to determine whether the continuance of this adjustment or a complete exclusion of law school faculty is more appropriate.

### Organization of the rest of the report

Part Two of this report explains the origins of the Commission's annual analyses of faculty salaries and the methodology it follows in these analyses.

Part Three then presents the detailed salary information on which the Commission's parity figures for 1989-90 are based.

The appendices contain background information on the Commission's analytical methods and this year's parity figures.

# 2 *Origins and Methods of the Analysis*

### History of the faculty salary reports

The impetus for the Commission's series of annual faculty salary reports came from the Master Plan Survey Team in 1960, which recommended that:

> 3. Greatly increased salaries and expanded fringe benefits, such as health and group life insurance, leaves, and travel funds to attend professional meetings, housing, parking and moving expenses, be provided for faculty members in order to make college and university teaching attractive as compared with business and industry.
>
> . . . .
>
> 8. Because of the continual change in faculty demand and supply, the coordinating agency annually collect pertinent data from all segments of higher education in the state and thereby make possible the testing of the assumptions underlying this report (Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, page 12).

For four years thereafter, the Legislature continually sought information regarding faculty compensation. This information came primarily from the Legislative Analyst in the Analysis of the Budget Bill and from the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in its annual reports to the Governor and the Legislature on the level of support for public higher education. While undoubtedly helpful to the process of determining faculty compensation levels, these reports were considered to be insufficient, especially by the Assembly, which consequently requested the Legislative Analyst to prepare a specific report on the subject (House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session; reproduced in Appendix C, page 27).

Early in the 1965 General Session, the Legislative Analyst presented his report (Appendix D, pages 29-38) and recommended that the process of developing data for use by the Legislature and the Governor in determining faculty compensation be formalized. This recommendation was embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965), which specifically directed the Coordinating Council -- the predecessor to the Postsecondary Education Commission -- to prepare annual reports in cooperation with the University of California and the California State Colleges.

Since that time, the Coordinating Council, and more recently the Commission, have submitted reports to the Governor and the Legislature. Prior to the 1973-74 budgetary cycle, only one report was submitted, usually in March or April. Between 1974-75 and 1985-86, the Commission compiled two reports -- a preliminary report transmitted in December, and a final report in April or May. The first was intended principally to assist the Department of Finance in developing cost-of-living adjustments presented in the Governor's Budget, while the second was used by the Legislative Analyst and the legislative fiscal committees during budget hearings. Each of them compared faculty salaries and the cost of fringe benefits in California's public four-year segments with those of other institutions (both within and outside of California) for the purpose of maintaining a competitive position.

### Changes in content and methodology

Over a period of several years, the Commission's salary reports became more comprehensive. Where they originally provided only comparison institution data, they were occasionally expanded to include summaries of economic conditions; comparisons with other professional workers; discussions of supplemental income and business and industrial competition for talent; analyses of collective bargaining; and community college faculty salaries, medical faculty salaries, and administrators' salaries. The last three of these additions to the annual reports were all requested by the Office of the Legislative Analyst: Community College and medical faculty salaries in 1979, and administrators' salaries at the

University of California and California State University in 1982.

In 1984, the Commission convened an advisory committee consisting of representatives from the segments, the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and other interested parties to review the methodology under which the salary reports are prepared each year. That committee's deliberations led to a number of substantive revisions which were approved by the Commission in March 1985 in its report, *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons*. Among the most significant of the changes were those to (1) create a new list of comparison institutions for the State University, (2) produce only a single report rather than a preliminary and a final report, and (3) provide University of California medical faculty salary information biennially rather than annually.

Particularly in the late 1970s and early '80s, the Commission's faculty salary reports included comprehensive surveys of economic conditions and salaries paid in other occupational fields. Such data seemed necessary at that time because faculty salaries at most institutions of higher education across the country were not keeping pace with changes in the cost of living or with salary increases granted to other professional workers. Since faculty salaries in California are based primarily on interinstitutional comparisons, those at the University of California and the California State University were undergoing an economic erosion comparable to that experienced nationally. That erosion made it increasingly difficult to recruit the most talented teachers and researchers, especially in competition with the substantially higher salaries generally available in business and industry. Consequently, in order to provide the Governor and the Legislature with as much information as possible on a complex situation, the Commission expanded considerably the scope of those salary analyses.

In the past six years -- 1984-85 to 1989-90 -- the salary deficiencies experienced by faculty in the two public universities have been corrected, as have those of most other institutions of higher education across the country. Display 1 on the opposite page shows the parity figures the Commission derived for the University and State University throughout the 1980s and compares those figures with the amounts actually approved by the Governor and Legislature, along with percentage increases in the national Consumer Price Index. The display shows that in 1982-83 and 1983-84, both the University and State University lagged behind their comparison institutions significantly. Although other institutions throughout the country experienced similar salary erosion, University and State University faculty salaries declined even further in relation to their comparison groups.

Since 1984-85, with the impressive recovery of the national economy and the even more impressive recovery of California's economy, funds have become available to restore faculty salaries to levels where the segments are better able to compete. As a result, there is less need for the extensive economic conditions and occupational salary data that the Commission published in prior years.

Two years ago, due primarily to issues of confidentiality and technical difficulties in collecting data in a timely fashion, the Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology met again to consider changes in the methodology. The committee suggested several revisions to the methodology at that meeting to address those issues. The Commission acted on those recommendations when it adopted its report, *Faculty Salary Revisions: A Revision of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefits*, at its June 8, 1987, meeting.

At that time, the University of California agreed to continue to use the eight comparison institutions it had used for the past 16 years. After further analyzing salary trends at these eight institutions later in the summer, however, the University determined that the economic situation, especially in the midwest, had adversely affected at least one of its comparison institutions -- the University of Wisconsin, Madison -- causing only marginal increases in its faculty salaries in contrast to increases elsewhere. Thus it asked the Commission that "in the best interest of the University and the State," other institutions be considered for its comparison group. Furthermore, it sought to build into the computed parity figure an additional percentage amount that would give it a "competitive edge" over its comparison institutions.

The University formally requested that the Commission approve a change in its list of comparison institutions by substituting the University of Virginia

*DISPLAY 1* *Comparisons of Faculty Salary Parity Adjustment Calculations by the Commission with Actual Percentage Increases Provided in State Budgets During This Decade*

| Year | University of California | | The California State University | | United States |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Commission | Budget | Commission | Budget | Consumer Price Index |
| 1979-80 | 12.6% | 14.5% | 10.1% | 14.5% | 13 3% |
| 1980-81 | 5.0 | 9.8 | 0.8 | 9.8 | 11.5 |
| 1981-82 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 6.0 | 8.7 |
| 1982-83 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| 1983-84 | 18.5 | 7.0 | 9.2 | 6.0 | 3.7 |
| 1984-85 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 10.0 | 3.9 |
| 1985-86 | 6.5 | 9.5 | N.A | 10.5 | 2.9 |
| 1986-87 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 2.7 |
| 1987-88 | 2.0 | 5.6 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 4.1 |
| 1988-89 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.5 (estimated) |
| 1989-90 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 (projected) |

N.A.: No parity adjustment was computed for the State University for the 1985-86 year.

Note: Some of the percentage increases provided in the Budget were for a period of time less than a full year. There have been changes in both the University and State University comparison groups over this time and there was a change in the State University's computation methodology in 1985.

Source: Consumer Price Index: Commission on State Finance. Remainder: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

for the University of Wisconsin and replacing Cornell University with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. As part of this proposal, the University agreed to abandon requests for the 1988-89 and subsequent fiscal years for "competitive edge" funds, noting that the traditional methodology of projected lag to parity would be sufficient given the new comparison group.

The Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology agreed to these changes to alleviate the need for "competitive edge" funds, and the Commission approved them at its February 8, 1988, meeting. Appendix B reproduces the current methodology, including that revised list of institutions.

**The issue of law school faculty salaries**

Supplemental Budget Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act directs the Commission to convene its Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology in order to evaluate whether the estimated average salaries at the State University's comparison institutions should be adjusted for the full effect, rather than the existing partial effect, of law school faculty in the comparison group. If the Commission determines that it is appropriate to retain the effect of any law school faculty in the computation of the comparison groups average salary, the Commission is asked to provide a justification for its decision.

The Commission is further directed to make its report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and

the legislative fiscal committees by April 30, 1989. The language further notes that "if any changes in the law school adjustment are found to be warranted, they shall not take effect until 1991-92."

The issue of the inclusion of law school faculty in computing the parity figure for the State University has been a contentious one. The issue arose when the Legislative Analyst had determined that the adjustment figure (a 0.2 percent reduction in the salary parity figure) reflected only the difference between the old list of State University comparison institutions and its new list established in 1985. The Analyst had assumed that the 0.2 percent adjustment was based on the full effect of *all* law school faculty and not the difference between the old and new comparison lists. In her opinion, *no* law school faculty should be included in computing the State University's parity figure, in that the State University employ no such faculty. She further argued that the University of California (which employs law school faculty) excludes such faculty when calculating its parity figure. The State's Department of Finance concurs with the Legislative Analyst's position regarding this matter.

On the other hand, State University officials have argued that its old list of comparison institutions included law faculty, in that data compiled from sources such as the American Association of University Professors included such data in its reports -- reports used by the segment in preparing data for the Commission. These officials therefore contended that the only correction should be that of excluding the estimated difference between the law faculty included in its old list of comparison institutions and those included in its new list. Furthermore, they argued that the current collective bargaining agreement with the faculty association is dependent upon the methodology adopted by the Commission, which reflects only the marginal difference between the current and former comparison institution lists, and not a total exclusion.

The Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology has met twice to discuss this issue and has agreed to meet again in the near future to discuss possible options to address the concerns of the Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance, and those of the State University. The committee is currently reviewing several options that may address these concerns, and the Commission hopes that consensus on the issue will be reached among the parties. The Commission will review the committee's findings and recommendations when it meets on April 17, 1989. If an impasse in the committee should develop, the Commission may recommend a change in the methodology that may not appease the concerns of either the Legislative Analyst or the State University.

---

**Other salary reports**

In addition to the current report, each spring the Commission publishes a supplemental salary report containing data that have been requested by the Office of the Legislative Analyst and incorporated into Supplemental Language to the Budget Act. That report covers four types of information over a four-year cycle, with only two types included every year. Those two consist of analyses of faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges and a comparison of administrators' salaries in the University and State University with those in other institutions nationally. The third -- on medical faculty compensation (that is, salaries plus clinical fees) at the University -- is included biennially in odd-numbered years. The fourth -- on the costs of faculty fringe benefits at the University and State University -- will be conducted when either the Department of Finance or the Office of the Legislative Analyst determines a need for such information. Initially, the methodology called for a fringe benefits report every four years. However, the salary methodology committee determined that because of the prohibitive expense of conducting such a study, the problems associated with obtaining comparable information, and the fact that the report was of little use during the budget process, that the study be conducted on an ad hoc basis. Thus the Commission expects to cover the former three topics in its supplemental salary report that it will discuss at its meeting on June 26, 1989.

# 3 *Projected Salaries Required for Parity at California's Public Universities*

IN this final section of the report, the Commission presents a comprehensive examination of faculty salary comparison institution data, first for the University of California and then for the California State University. With the advent of computerized spreadsheets at the Commission, the time involved to complete a comprehensive analysis of the raw data has been reduced to a matter of days, and this reduction in time has allowed for the detailed analysis that follows. In its analysis, the Commission found no errors in the segmental computations.

## University of California

On November 9, 1988, the Regents of the University of California met and requested the Governor and the Legislature to approve funding sufficient to grant University faculty an average salary increase of 4.6 percent. This amount was to maintain parity with the University's eight comparison institutions. This percentage increase was based on final data for seven of eight comparison institutions, and reflected a projected increase for the University of Michigan, which had not as yet provided final data. However, on December 5, the University submitted a subsequent report (Appendix D, pages 39-42) that included final data for Michigan and showed that a 4.7 percent increase was needed to maintain parity.

### *Projected salaries*

Display 2 on the next page shows the average salaries by rank at the comparison institutions in 1983-84 and 1988-89, as well as the University's position in each of these two years. It indicates that, over the past five years, the University has improved its position from below the average at all three ranks to slightly above it at the ranks of professor and assistant professor and slightly below it for associate professors. Since most of the University's new hires will be at the assistant professor level, this should place the University in a strong competitive position if the margin is maintained. It should be noted, however, that because the University faculty will receive their final salary adjustment on June 1, 1989, the computed average annual by rank salaries displayed for academic year 1988-89 are greater than the salaries actually earned by the faculty for this entire academic year. In reality, the salaries for academic year 1988-89 were: Professors, $66,260; Associate Professors, $43,816; and Assistant Professors, $38,215.

### *Conversion factors*

Display 3 on page 9 shows the parity calculations for the 1989-90 fiscal year, and it indicates that the University will require an increase of 4.7 percent to maintain parity at the mean of its comparison group. An important element in deriving institutional average salaries is the factor used to convert eleven-month salaries to nine-month salaries. In most cases, this conversion is derived by dividing nine by eleven to produce a factor of 0.8182. Historically, however, the University has used a conversion factor of 0.86 to adjust eleven-month salaries to nine-month salaries. To assure consistency, the 0.86 factor is applied to each of the University's comparison institutions.

Display 4 on page 10 shows the University's 1988-89 salary schedule, with the actual conversions.

*DISPLAY 2 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1983-84 and 1988-89*

| Comparison Institution 1983-84 Data | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Institution H | $57,806 (1) | $33,150 (4) | $27,767 (3) |
| Institution A | 54,101 (2) | 37,585 (1) | 29,657 (1) |
| Institution D | 52,101 (3) | 31,888 (6) | 25,066 (8) |
| Institution F | 52,100 (4) | 36,900 (2) | 29,300 (2) |
| Institution C | 48,593 (5) | 34,407 (3) | 27,020 (6) |
| **University of California** | **47,128 (6)** | **31,827 (7)** | **26,706 (7)** |
| Institution B | 45,600 (7) | 30,900 (8) | 23,400 (9) |
| Institution G | 43,912 (8) | 30,660 (9) | 27,112 (4) |
| Institution E | 43,696 (9) | 32,509 (5) | 27,050 (5) |
| Comparison Institution Average | $49,739 | $33,500 | $27,047 |

| Comparison Institution 1988-89 Data | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Institution H | $77,269(1) | $44,179 (7) | $40,000 (3) |
| Institution A | 74,383(2) | 52,800 (1) | 41,397 (2) |
| Institution D | 70,608(3) | 43,137 (8) | 34,890 (9) |
| Institution F | 69,675(4) | 51,349 (2) | 41,632 (1) |
| **University of California** | **68,932(5)** | **45,240 (5)** | **39,559 (4)** |
| Institution C | 65,050(6) | 46,526 (4) | 37,014 (6) |
| Institution B | 64,560(7) | 44,395 (6) | 35,592 (8) |
| Institution E | 61,572(8) | 46,985 (3) | 39,326 (5) |
| Institution G | 56,671(9) | 40,236 (9) | 35,632 (7) |
| Comparison Institution Average | $67,474 | $46,201 | $38,185 |

Note: The data in the 1988-89 table for the University of California reflect salary increases awarded on June 1, 1989. Actual salaries earned by University faculty for the 1988-89 fiscal year are thus slightly lower than listed here, and these differences could affect the University's ranking. The rankings for several comparison institutions may also be affected by salary increases given at times other than the first day of the fiscal year.

Source: Office of the President, University of California.

*DISPLAY 3 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1983-84 and 1988-89, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1989 90, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1989-90 Staffing Patterns*

| Academic Rank | Comparison Group Average Salaries 1983-84 | Comparison Group Average Salaries 1988-89 | Compound Rate of Increase | Comparison Group Projected Salaries 1989-90 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $49,739 | $67,474 | 6.289% | $71,717 |
| Associate Professor | 33,500 | 46,201 | 6.640 | 49,269 |
| Assistant Professor | 27,047 | 38,185 | 7.141 | 40,912 |

| Academic Rank | University of California Actual Average Salaries 1988-89 | Comparison Group Average Salaries | | Percentage Increase Required in University of California Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Actual 1988-89 | Projected 1989-90 | Actual 1988-89 | Projected 1989-90 |
| Professor | $68,932 | $67,474 | $71,717 | -2.12% | 4.04% |
| Associate Professor | 45,240 | 46,201 | 49,269 | 2.12 | 8.91 |
| Assistant Professor | 39,559 | 38,185 | 40,912 | -3.47 | 3.42 |
| All Ranks Averages (UC Staffing) | 59,469 | 58,497 | 62,262 | -1.63 | 4.70 |

| Institutional Budget Year Staffing Pattern (Full Time Equivalent) | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of California | 3,457 | 1,055 | 889 | 5,401 |
| Comparison Institutions | 4,177 | 1,892 | 1,830.5 | 7,899.5 |

Source: University of California, Office of the President, reproduced in Appendix E.

*DISPLAY 4* *University of California 1988-89 Salary Schedule for Nine and Eleven Month Faculty, with Percentage Differences (Effective June 1, 1989)*

| Nine-Month Faculty by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Step 6 | Step 7 | Step 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $46,100 | $50,900 | $55,800 | $61,100 | $66,400 | $71,900 | $77,800 | $84,000 |
| Associate Professor | $38,300 | $40,600 | $42,600 | $46,000 | $50,800 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Assistant Professor | $32,400 | $33,700 | $34,900 | $36,500 | $38,200 | $40,500 | N/A | N/A |

| Eleven-Month Faculty by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Step 6 | Step 7 | Step 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $53,600 | $59,000 | $64,800 | $70,900 | $77,000 | $83,400 | $90,200 | $97,900 |
| Associate Professor | $44,400 | $47,200 | $49,500 | $53,500 | $58,900 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Assistant Professor | $37,700 | $38,900 | $40,500 | $42,300 | $44,300 | $47,100 | N/A | N/A |

| Percentage Difference by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Step 6 | Step 7 | Step 8 | Overall Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | 86.01% | 86.27% | 86.11% | 86.18% | 86.23% | 86.21% | 86.25% | 85.80% | |
| Associate Professor | 86.26 | 86.02 | 86.06 | 85.98 | 86.25 | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| Assistant Professor | 85.94 | 86.63 | 86.17 | 86.29 | 86.23 | 85.99 | N/A | N/A | |
| Average | 86.07% | 86.31% | 86.11% | 86.15% | 86.24% | 86.10% | 86.25% | 85.80% | 86.13% |

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

**The California State University**

*Shifts in rank*

Over the past five years, the California State University has improved its national competitive position significantly. Displays 5 and 6 below and on page 12 show average salaries at its comparison institutions in 1983-84 and 1988-89, as well as the State University faculty's relative position on each list. These displays indicate that while the State University's ladder faculty ranked either seventeenth or eighteenth in each of its top three professorial categories in 1983-84, it improved to between fourth and eighth by 1988-89.

*DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1983-84*

| | Professor | | Associate Professor | | Assistant Professor | | Instructor | | Total Faculty | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Institution | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Weighted Average Salary |
| Institution Q | 365 | $48,318 (1) | 379 | $33,451 (3) | 320 | $27,644 (1) | 35 | $25,835 (1) | 1,099 | $36,455 (2) |
| Institution J | 123 | 48,300 (2) | 131 | 35,100 (1) | 118 | 25,600 (5) | 17 | 19,800 (12) | 389 | 35,723 (3) |
| Institution N | 231 | 47,611 (3) | 236 | 34,848 (2) | 141 | 26,280 (3) | 0 | 0 | 608 | 37,710 (1) |
| Institution P | 86 | 42,565 (4) | 104 | 31,208 (6) | 89 | 24,951 (10) | 4 | 20,700 (8) | 283 | 32,543 (10) |
| Institution F | 264 | 42,100 (5) | 256 | 31,100 (7) | 170 | 25,300 (7) | 37 | 18,200 (15) | 727 | 33,082 (7) |
| Institution D | 152 | 41,100 (6) | 241 | 31,000 (9) | 104 | 26,000 (4) | 25 | 21,400 (4) | 522 | 32,485 (11) |
| Institution C | 82 | 41,000 (7) | 60 | 31,900 (4) | 65 | 24,500 (13) | 0 | 0 | 207 | 33,181 (6) |
| Institution B | 98 | 40,800 (8) | 97 | 31,600 (5) | 51 | 26,700 (2) | 18 | 23,100 (2) | 264 | 33,489 (4) |
| Institution R | 406 | 40,711 (9) | 424 | 29,931 (14) | 423 | 24,673 (12) | 122 | 18,914 (14) | 1,375 | 30,519 (17) |
| Institution S | 318 | 40,644 (10) | 315 | 30,246 (13) | 200 | 24,223 (16) | 14 | 17,667 (17) | 847 | 32,820 (9) |
| Institution A | 482 | 40,500 (11) | 407 | 31,000 (9) | 296 | 25,000 (9) | 29 | 19,500 (13) | 1,214 | 33,034 (8) |
| Institution K | 308 | 40,000 (12) | 267 | 29,700 (15) | 238 | 25,500 (6) | 20 | 21,400 (4) | 833 | 32,109 (12) |
| Institution G | 142 | 39,200 (13) | 221 | 31,100 (7) | 198 | 25,100 (8) | 28 | 22,900 (3) | 589 | 30,646 (16) |
| Institution H | 186 | 39,200 (13) | 120 | 30,900 (11) | 142 | 24,300 (15) | 35 | 18,200 (15) | 483 | 31,236 (13) |
| Institution O | 153 | 39,000 (15) | 235 | 30,300 (12) | 177 | 24,500 (13) | 8 | 20,400 (9) | 573 | 30,693 (15) |
| Institution I | 55 | 38,716 (16) | 110 | 28,298 (19) | 72 | 22,887 (20) | 41 | 16,939 (18) | 278 | 27,282 (21) |
| Institution T | 242 | 37,779 (17) | 270 | 27,545 (20) | 211 | 23,335 (18) | 18 | 20,771 (7) | 741 | 29,524 (18) |
| **The California State University** | **6,530** | **37,542 (18)** | **2,532** | **28,885 (17)** | **1,520** | **23,594 (17)** | **176** | **21,031 (6)** | **10,758** | **33,264 (5)** |
| Institution M | 134 | 36,962 (19) | 109 | 28,938 (16) | 67 | 23,151 (19) | 8 | 20,147 (11) | 318 | 30,879 (14) |
| Institution L | 38 | 36,000 (20) | 28 | 27,000 (21) | 26 | 22,200 (21) | 0 | 0 | 92 | 29,361 (19) |
| Institution E | 83 | 35,500 (21) | 92 | 28,400 (18) | 84 | 24,700 (11) | 20 | 20,400 (9) | 279 | 28,825 (20) |
| Comparison Institution Totals | 3,948 | $41,443 | 4,102 | $30,887 | 3,192 | $25,073 | 479 | $19,990 | 11,721 | $32,414 |

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

*DISPLAY 6 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1988-89*

| Institution | Professor | | Associate Professor | | Assistant Professor | | Instructor | | Total Faculty | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Average Salary | No. | Weighted Average Salary |
| Institution J | 117 | $67,263 (1) | 152 | $50,028 (1) | 92 | $41,369 (1) | 20 | $28,730 (5) | 381 | $52,112 (1) |
| Institution Q | 432 | 64,989 (2) | 414 | 45,670 (3) | 322 | 38,777 (2) | 28 | 40,288 (1) | 1,196 | 50,666 (3) |
| Institution N | 240 | 63,560 (3) | 258 | 46,406 (2) | 122 | 35,503 (5) | 0 | 0 | 620 | 50,901 (2) |
| Institution R | 547 | 59,900 (4) | 545 | 42,600 (6) | 342 | 36,500 (3) | 81 | 24,900 (13) | 1,515 | 46,523 (6) |
| Institution I | 71 | 57,576 (5) | 113 | 41,421 (9) | 118 | 34,588 (8) | 38 | 24,861 (14) | 340 | 40,572 (16) |
| Institution K | 376 | 57,404 (6) | 301 | 41,594 (7) | 207 | 35,872 (4) | 12 | 28,016 (7) | 896 | 46,725 (5) |
| Institution P | 97 | 57,284 (7) | 125 | 41,241 (10) | 90 | 32,796 (16) | 0 | 0 | 312 | 43,793 (10) |
| **The California State University** | **7,376** | **55,132 (8)** | **2,378** | **43,137 (4)** | **1,720** | **34,947 (7)** | **229** | **29,145 (4)** | **11,703** | **49,220 (4)** |
| Institution D | 162 | 54,173 (9) | 232 | 40,750 (12) | 93 | 33,328 (13) | 33 | 26,143 (11) | 520 | 42,677 (11) |
| Institution F | 261 | 53,716 (10) | 260 | 39,505 (15) | 191 | 32,576 (17) | 34 | 24,251 (15) | 746 | 42,008 (13) |
| Institution A | 522 | 53,646 (11) | 465 | 40,576 (13) | 314 | 34,132 (9) | 27 | 27,478 (8) | 1,328 | 43,923 (8) |
| Institution G | 147 | 53,500 (12) | 223 | 41,500 (8) | 173 | 33,200 (14) | 15 | 33,500 (2) | 558 | 41,873 (14) |
| Institution S | 290 | 53,179 (13) | 289 | 40,837 (11) | 198 | 35,432 (6) | 6 | 25,207 (12) | 783 | 43,922 (9) |
| Institution C | 82 | 52,659 (14) | 57 | 39,721 (14) | 78 | 32,949 (15) | 1 | 24,000 (16) | 218 | 42,092 (12) |
| Institution B | 92 | 52,455 (15) | 83 | 42,659 (5) | 42 | 33,777 (10) | 15 | 28,628 (6) | 232 | 44,028 (7) |
| Institution O | 170 | 50,141 (16) | 232 | 37,199 (19) | 142 | 32,467 (18) | 20 | 26,500 (9) | 564 | 39,529 (18) |
| Institution T | 259 | 49,557 (17) | 289 | 36,756 (20) | 188 | 33,649 (11) | 5 | 30,867 (3) | 741 | 40,402 (17) |
| Institution M | 114 | 49,185 (18) | 116 | 38,790 (16) | 88 | 33,448 (12) | 3 | 26,297 (10) | 321 | 40,900 (15) |
| Institution E | 90 | 49,020 (19) | 108 | 38,500 (17) | 96 | 33,246 (19) | 12 | 21,599 (18) | 306 | 39,283 (19) |
| Institution L | 43 | 46,235 (20) | 26 | 35,295 (21) | 38 | 28,627 (21) | 0 | 0 | 107 | 37,323 (21) |
| Institution H | 196 | 46,093 (21) | 123 | 37,617 (18) | 117 | 31,332 (20) | 23 | 23,369 (17) | 459 | 38,920 (20) |
| Comparison Institution Totals | 4,308 | $55,901 | 4,411 | $41,479 | 3,051 | $34,801 | 373 | $27,069 | 12,143 | $44,475 |

Note: The data in this display for the California State University reflect salary increases awarded on June 1, 1989. Actual salaries earned by State University faculty for the 1988-89 fiscal year are thus slightly lower than listed here, and these differences could affect the State University's ranking. The rankings for several comparison institutions may also be affected by salary increases given at times other than the first day of the fiscal year.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

Because of the large number of State University faculty at the full-professor level, the all ranks weighted average actually placed the faculty in fifth position in 1983-84 and fourth position in 1988-89. If something near this ranking continues, it will place the State University in a very competitive position in the years ahead, when many new faculty are expected to be hired.

The relatively strong upward movement in the State University's ranking among its comparison institutions stemmed principally from salary increases granted in the past two years, which occurred due to a change in its group of comparison institutions in 1985. Institutions in the revised group have a higher average salary base and may have experienced greater salary increases than those institutions on the former list.

In its 1986-87 report, the Commission noted that the State University encountered considerable difficulty in its attempts to obtain reliable data from its new list of comparison institutions. Four of the institutions declined to participate with the annual survey, and several others were not prepared to supply the data in a timely fashion. After the advisory committee was reconvened in 1986 to discuss the problem, it unanimously approved replacements for the four institutions that would not provide data.

Following that meeting, State University officials worked to develop relationships with personnel at the comparison institutions, but it soon became evident that complete current-year data could not be obtained from all of them in November of each year, nor from any other list of institutions that could conceivably be established, because many universities do not make computer runs of their faculty payrolls until after the November deadline required by the current methodology. Because the Department of Finance requests this information by December 5 of each year for consideration in the Governor's Budget, estimates continue to be necessary for those institutions not supplying current-year information.

In its attempts to make the estimates as accurate as possible, the Chancellor's Office of the State University analyzed the differences between the cost-of-living adjustments projected to be given to faculty, and those actually distributed to them. This analysis showed that the actual changes in any institution's average salaries increased by only about 95 percent of the projected percentage increase -- a difference caused by changes in staffing patterns at the institutions involved. Accordingly, the State University suggested that, when current-year data cannot be obtained, but the projected cost-of-living adjustment is known, that that percentage be multiplied by 0.95. This relationship will be monitored to determine if the 95 percent adjustment continues to be valid.

*Law school faculty salaries*

Another issue unresolved in this report concerns the adjustment for law school faculty. As discussed in Parts One and Two, salaries paid to law faculty at the comparison institutions are included in the raw data supplied to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and published in its *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession*. That report, which includes data also collected by the Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education, constitutes the primary source of faculty salary data in the United States. At present, eight of the State University's 20 comparison institutions operate law schools, and because law faculty are paid more than regular faculty, a deduction is made in the State University's parity figure to reflect the fact that it operates no law schools.

In the 1986-87 report, the effect of law faculty salaries on those of the new list of institutions was unknown, so a rough estimate of 0.8 percent was deducted from the parity figure. In 1987-88, however, the Office of the Chancellor analyzed the data from the eight comparison institutions that operate law schools, compared them to the data from the old list, and determined that the true deduction should be only 0.2 percent. Commission staff then verified the accuracy of the Chancellor's staff analysis, and the 0.2 percent deduction was reflected in the 1987-88 parity figures. The 0.2 percent adjustment is continued this year, as is shown in Display 7 on page 14. However, the issue of including law faculty at all continues to be debated, as noted on page 6.

Other deductions of 0.2 percent for turnover and promotions, and 0.64 percent to reflect an additional appropriation for merit salary adjustments, are also included. The first is unchanged from last year's cycle, while the second is reduced from last year's estimate of 0.68 percent.

Complete current-year data for this year's report were obtained from all 20 comparison institutions. Furthermore, it should be noted that because the State University faculty will receive their final salary adjustment on June 1, 1989, the computed average annual by rank salaries displayed for 1988-89 is greater than the salaries actually earned by the

*DISPLAY 7* *California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1989-90 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1983-84 and 1988-89; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1988-89 Projected Salaries; State University 1988-89 Average Salaries; 1989-90 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1988-89 Staffing Patterns)*

| Academic Rank | Comparison Group Weighted by Total 1983-84 | Average Salaries Faculty at Each Rank 1988-89 | Five-Year Percentage Rate of Change | Comparison Group Projected Salaries 1989-90 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $41,443 | $55,901 | 6.171% | $59,349 |
| Associate Professor | 30,887 | 41,479 | 6.075% | 43,999 |
| Assistant Professor | 25,073 | 34,801 | 6.776% | 37,159 |
| Instructor | 19,990 | 27,069 | 6.251% | 28,761 |

| Academic Rank | State University Average Salaries 1988-89 | Comparison Group Average Salaries | | Percentage Increase Required in CSU Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1988-89 | 1989-90 | 1988-89 | 1989-90 |
| Professor | $55,132 | $55,901 | $59,349 | 1.40% | 7.65% |
| Associate Professor | 43,137 | 41,479 | 43,999 | -3.84% | 2.00% |
| Assistant Professor | 34,947 | 34,801 | 37,159 | -0.42% | 6.33% |
| Instructor | 29,145 | 27,069 | 28,761 | -7.12% | -1.32% |
| All Ranks Averages | | | | | |
| Weighted by Staffing | $49,220 | $49,306 | $52,370 | 0.17% | 6.40% |
| Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing | $44,905 | $44,475 | $47,258 | -0.96% | 5.24% |
| Mean All Ranks Average and Gross Percentage Amount | $47,062 | $46,890 | $49,814 | -0.37% | 5.85% |
| Adjustments | | | | | |
| Turnover and Promotions | | | -$94 | | 0.20% |
| Effect of Law Faculty | | | -$94 | | 0.20% |
| Merit Award Adjustment | | | -$320 | | 0.64% |
| Net Parity Salary and Percent | | | $49,306 | | 4.81% |

| Institutional Staffing Patterns | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor | Instructor | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| California State University | 7,376 | 2,378 | 1,720 | 229 | 11,703 |
| Comparison Institutions | 4,308 | 4,411 | 3,051 | 373 | 12,143 |

Source: Office of the Chancellor, The California State University (reproduced in Appendix F).

faculty for this entire academic year. In reality the salaries for academic year 1988-89 were: Professors, $53,275; Associate Professors, $41,685; Assistant Professors, $33,771; and Instructors, $28,164.

*Conversion factors*

One of the required calculations to derive an average salary figure for each comparison institution is a conversion from eleven-month to nine-month faculty, since all average salaries are based on nine-month contracts. In its annual report on the economic status of the profession, the AAUP uses a factor of 0.8182 -- a figure derived by dividing nine by eleven. In some cases, however, institutions use different conversion factors to build their budgets, and these are all specified by the AAUP in footnotes to its report and used to derive average salary figures. In many cases, especially in independent institutions, no published salary schedules or institutional conversion factors exist, since all faculty contracts are negotiated individually in terms of both length of annual service and compensation. In these cases, all conversions used to derive average salaries are artificial, and the AAUP simply applies the 0 8182 factor as a reasonable estimate.

In the State University, as shown in Display 8 on page 16, the actual relationship between nine-month and eleven-month faculty is almost 0.87 percent, but for the purposes of the annual salary reports, and reporting to the AAUP, the 0.8182 figure continues to be used for the purposes of assuring analytical consistency with the comparison institutions.

With all of the adjustments discussed above, the State University's parity figure for 1989-90 becomes 4.81 percent.

*DISPLAY 8* *California State University 1988-89 Salary Schedule for Nine-Month and Eleven-Month Regular Faculty, with Percentage Differences (Effective June 1, 1989)*

| Nine-Month Faculty by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $45,959 | $48,145 | $50,470 | $52,920 | $55,457 |
| Associate Professor | 36,373 | 38,119 | 39,928 | 41,838 | 43,836 |
| Assistant Professor | 28,885 | 30,242 | 31,674 | 33,169 | 34,752 |
| Instructor | 26,435 | 27,616 | 28,885 | 30,242 | 31,674 |

| Eleven-Month Faculty by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | $52,920 | $55,457 | $58,159 | $60,961 | $63,913 |
| Associate Professor | 41,838 | 43,836 | 45,959 | 48,145 | 50,470 |
| Assistant Professor | 33,169 | 34,752 | 36,373 | 38,119 | 39,928 |
| Instructor | 30,242 | 31,674 | 33,169 | 34,752 | 36,373 |

| Percentage Difference by Rank | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Overall Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | 86.85% | 86.81% | 86.78% | 86.81% | 86.77% | |
| Associate Professor | 86.94 | 86.96 | 86.88 | 86.90 | 86.86 | |
| Assistant Professor | 87.08 | 87.02 | 87.08 | 87.01 | 87.04 | |
| Instructor | 87.41 | 87.19 | 87.08 | 87.02 | 87.08 | |
| Average | 87.07% | 87.00% | 86.96% | 86.94% | 86.94% | 86.98% |

Source: California State University, Office of the Chancellor. (Incremental Salary Adjustment computed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission)

# *Appendix A*

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session,**
**Relative to Academic Salaries and Welfare Benefits**

WHEREAS, The Joint Legislative Budget Committee pursuant to House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session, has had prepared and has adopted a report of the Legislative Analyst containing findings and recommendations as to salaries and the general economic welfare, including fringe benefits, of faculty members of the California institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The study of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee found that the reporting of salaries and fringe benefits as it has been made previously to the Legislature has been fragmentary and has lacked necessary consistency, with the result that the Legislature's consideration of the salary requests of the institutions of higher learning has been made unnecessarily difficult; and

WHEREAS, The report recommends that the Legislature and the Governor should receive each December 1 a report from the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, plus such supplementary information as the University of California and the California State Colleges desire to furnish independently, containing comprehensive and consistently reported information as outlined specifically in the report adopted by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee; and

WHEREAS, The reporting recommended by the committee would include essential data on the size and composition of the faculty, the establishment of comprehensive bases for comparing and evaluating faculty salaries, the nature and cost of existing and desired fringe benefits, the nature and extent of total compensation to the faculty, special privileges and benefits, and a description and measurement of supplementary income, all of which affect the welfare of the faculties and involve implications to the state now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, the Assembly thereof concurring*, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in cooperation with the University of California and the California State Colleges shall submit annually to the Governor and the Legislature not later than December 1 a faculty salary and welfare benefits report containing the basic information recommended in the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee as filed with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the Assembly, under date of March 22, 1965.

# *Appendix B*

NOTE: The following material is reproduced from Chapter Two, "The Revised Methodology," of the second edition of *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports and Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs.* Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, March 1985. pp. 7-16 (second edition issued February 1988).

**The following procedures will be employed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission to develop its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits in California public higher education**

### 1. Number and timing of reports

**One report will be prepared by the Commission each year. That report will contain current-year data from both the University of California's and the California State University's comparison institutions, such data to be submitted by the segments to the Commission, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst not later than December 5 each year. The segmental submissions are to include total nine and eleven-month expenditures, and the number of faculty, at each rank specified in Section 4 of this document for each comparison institution. Comparison institutions should be identified only by letter code. Commission staff shall verify the accuracy of the segmental calculations and report the results of its analysis to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst on December 5, or the first working day following December 5 if the latter falls on a weekend. The Commission shall submit a report on the subject to the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee not later than February 15.**

### 2. Principle of parity

**The report will indicate needed percentage increases (or decreases) for the forthcoming fiscal year in salaries and fringe benefit costs for University of California and California State University faculty to achieve and maintain parity with comparison institution faculty at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and (at the State University only) instructor. Parity is defined as the mean of all salaries paid by the comparison institutions as a whole at each rank. A separate list of comparison institutions will be used by each of the four-year California segments of higher education.**

### 3. Comparison institutions

*University of California*

Comparison institutions for the University of California, with independent institutions asterisked (*), will be the following:

Harvard University*
Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
Stanford University*
State University of New York at Buffalo
University of Illinois, Urbana
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Virginia
Yale University*

(On February 8, 1988, the Commission voted to replace Cornell University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison with MIT and the University of Virginia, respectively.)

*The California State University*

Comparison institutions for the California State University will be the following for the years 1987-88 through 1996-97.

**Northeast**
Bucknell University*

Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, Newark
State University of New York, Albany
Tufts University*
University of Bridgeport*

**South**

Georgia State University
North Carolina State University
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

**North Central**

Cleveland State University
Loyola University, Chicago*
Mankato State University
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

**West**

Arizona State University
Reed College*
University of Colorado, Denver
University of Nevada, Reno
University of Southern California*
University of Texas, Arlington

* Independent Institution

---

### 4. Faculty to be included and excluded

*University of California*

Faculty to be included in the comparisons are those at the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor (the University does not use the rank of instructor) employed on nine and eleven-month (prorated) appointments, with the exception of faculty in law, the health sciences, summer sessions, extension programs, and laboratory schools, to the extent that these faculty are covered by salary scales or schedules other than those of the regular faculty. Faculty on the special salary schedules for engineering, computer science, and business administration will be included with the regular faculty.

Faculty members to be included are those assigned to instruction (regardless of their assignments for research and other University purposes), department chairmen (if not on an administrative salary schedule), and faculty on salaried sabbatical leave.

The number of University faculty will be reported on a full-time-equivalent basis.

*The California State University*

Faculty to be included in the comparisons are those with full-time appointments at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor, employed on nine and eleven-month (prorated) appointments, department chairmen, and faculty on salaried sabbatical or special leave. Faculty teaching seminar sessions or extension will be excluded.

Funds appropriated for "outstanding professor awards" will be included in the State University's mean salaries.

The number of State University and comparison institution faculty will be reported on a headcount basis.

---

### 5. Computation of comparison institution mean salaries

As indicated below, the University and the State University use different methods to compute mean salaries in their respective groups of comparison institutions. The Commission will provide a detailed explanation of these differences in its annual report.

*University of California*

For the University's comparison group, the mean salary at each rank will be obtained for each comparison institution. The mean salary at each rank for the comparison group as a whole will then be calculated by adding the mean salaries at the eight comparison institutions and dividing by eight.

*The California State University*

For the State University's comparison group, the total actual salary dollars paid at each rank for the group as a whole will be divided by the number of faculty within the rank at all 20 institutions to derive the mean salary for each rank.

---

### 6. Five-year compound rate of salary growth

In order to compute the estimated salaries to be paid

by the comparison institutions in the budget year, a five-year compound rate of change in salaries will be computed using actual salary data for the current year and the fifth preceding year.

Each segment will compute the mean salary, by rank, for their respective comparison groups as specified in Section 5 above. Each will then calculate the annual compound rate of growth at each rank between the current year and the fifth year preceding the current year. These rates of change will then be used to project mean salaries for that rank forward one year to the budget year.

In the event that neither current-year staffing nor mean salary data can be obtained from a comparison institution in a timely manner, the staffing pattern and salary expenditure data from the prior year will be used with the expenditures at each rank being incremented by 95 percent of the anticipated current-year salary increase. If current-year staffing data are available, but not current-year salary expenditure data, the staffing data will be used with the prior-year expenditures at each rank being incremented by 100 percent of the anticipated current-year salary increase.

When a comparison institution does not supply both its current-year staffing and salary expenditure data, and when that institution does not anticipate a general faculty salary increase in the current year, the prior-year staffing and expenditure data will be assumed to remain unchanged for the current year.

When current year staffing and salary expenditure data are available, but do not reflect the full extent of planned salary adjustments (e.g., reported data do not include a specified percentage to be granted after July 1 of a given fiscal year), the salary expenditures at each rank will be adjusted to reflect the full extent of the planned adjustment.

When complete staffing and expenditure data are available for neither the current nor prior years, the most recent year for which complete data are available will be used. In such a case, expenditures at each rank will be incremented by 95 percent of the anticipated salary expenditures increase for each year in which complete data are unavailable.

If the University of California or the California State University are unable to obtain complete current-year staffing and salary expenditure data from all of their respective comparison institutions by December 5 of any year, a supplemental report will be filed with the Commission, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst as soon as the data become available, but not later than April 1 of the subsequent calendar year, such update to include all additional data received since December 5. If the comparison institution data remain incomplete as of the April 1 date, a final report will be filed on June 30, or at such earlier time as the University or the State University are able to supply complete data.

---

**7. Fringe benefits**

On June 30, 1989, and every fourth year thereafter, the University of California and the California State University shall submit reports on faculty fringe benefits for the preceding fiscal year, such reports to include the following information for their own system and for each comparison institution:

a. The mean employer and employee contribution for retirement programs; health insurance programs (including medical, dental, vision and any other medical coverage); Social Security; and life, unemployment, workers' compensation, and disability insurance;

b. The mean contribution needed to fund the "normal costs" of the retirement systems; and

c. Any further information available, in addition to the cost data, on actual benefits received.

---

**8. All-ranks average salaries**

All-ranks mean salaries will be calculated for each segment in the current year, and the comparison institutions' mean salaries in the current and budget years, by using the following procedures.

*University of California*

Both the University's and its comparison institutions' mean salaries at each rank will be weighted by the University's projected budget-year staffing pattern. The all-ranks mean salaries produced thereby will be compared and percentage differentials computed for both the current and budget years. The percentage differential between the Uni-

versity's current year all-ranks mean salary and the comparison group's projected budget year all-ranks mean salary will constitute the percentage amount by which University salaries will have to be increased (or decreased) to achieve parity with the comparison group in the budget year.

*The California State University*

Both the State University's and its comparison institutions' current-year staffing patterns will be employed. The rank-by-rank mean salaries will be separately weighted by the respective staffing patterns for both the current and budget years so that two sets of all-ranks mean salaries will be derived. The two all-ranks mean salaries for the State University in the current year (the first weighted by the State University's staffing pattern and the second by the comparison group's staffing pattern) will be added together and divided by two to produce the overall mean. Similarly, the current and budget-year all-ranks mean salaries for the comparison institutions will be added and divided by two to produce overall means for both the current and budget years. The State University's current-year all-ranks mean salary will then be compared to the current and budget-year comparison institution all-ranks mean salary to produce both current and budget-year parity percentages. The percentage differential between the State University's current-year all-ranks mean salary and the comparison group's projected budget-year all-ranks mean salary will constitute the "Gross Percentage Amount" by which State University salaries will need to be increased or decreased to achieve parity with the comparison group in the budget year.

The "Gross Percentage Amount" will be reduced by applying three adjustments:

- First, two-tenths of one percent (0.2 percent) will be deducted to account for the effect of turnover and promotions in the budget year.
- Second, an additional two-tenths of one percent (0.2 percent) will be deducted to account for the effect of higher paid law-school faculty in eight of the State University's comparison institutions.
- Third, an additional percentage amount, to account for the effect of unallocated merit salary awards, shall be deducted when applicable. The amount to be deducted shall be mutually agreed to by Commission staff and the Chancellor's Office of the State University.

---

**9. Administrative, medical, and community college salaries**

*Administrative salaries*

In its annual faculty salary report, the Commission will report the salaries paid to selected central-office and campus-based administrators at the University and the State University. The Commission shall also include data on comparable campus-based positions from both the University's and the State University's respective comparison institutions. The University and State University will use the same group of comparison institutions as for their faculty surveys.

The campus-based administrative positions to be surveyed shall include those listed in Display 1:

In addition to these campus-based positions for which the national survey shall be conducted, the University and the State University shall also report the salaries paid to all central office personnel with the position titles listed in Display 2.

*Medical faculty salaries*

The Commission will include data on comparative salaries and compensation plans for the University of California and a select group of comparison institutions on a biennial basis commencing with the 1985-86 academic year. Comparison institutions to be surveyed will be Stanford University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, the University of Michigan, the University of North Carolina, the University of Texas at Houston, the University of Wisconsin, and Yale University. Disciplines to be surveyed will be internal medicine, pediatrics, and surgery, which, taken together, will be considered representative of the medical profession as a whole.

*Community college faculty salaries*

In its annual report on faculty salaries, the Commis-

*DISPLAY 1* *Campus-Based Administrative Positions for Which Current-Year Salaries at the University of California, the California State University, and Their Respective Comparison Institutions Are to Be Reported in the Commission's Annual Administrators' Salary Survey*

| University of California | The California State University |
|---|---|
| 1. Chief Executive Officer/Single Institution | 1. Chief Executive Officer/Single Institution |
| 2. Chief Academic Officer | 2. Chief Academic Officer |
| 3. Chief Business Officer | 3. Chief Business Officer |
| 4. Director of Personnel/Human Resources | 4. Director of Personnel/Human Resources |
| 5. Chief Budget Officer | 5. Chief Budget Officer |
| 6. Director of Library Services | 6. Director of Library Services |
| 7. Director of Computer Services | 7. Director of Computer Services |
| 8. Director of Physical Plant | 8. Director of Physical Plant |
| 9. Director of Campus Security | 9. Director of Campus Security |
| 10. Director of Information Systems | 10. Director of Institutional Research |
| 11. Director of Student Financial Aid | 11. Director of Student Financial Aid |
| 12. Director of Athletics | 12. Director of Athletics |
| 13. Dean of Agriculture | 13. Dean of Agriculture |
| 14. Dean of Arts and Sciences | 14. Dean of Arts and Sciences |
| 15. Dean of Business | 15. Dean of Business |
| 16. Dean of Education | 16. Dean of Education |
| 17. Dean of Engineering | 17. Dean of Engineering |
| 18. Dean of the Graduate Division | 18. Dean of the Graduate Division |

*DISPLAY 2* *Central-Office Administrative Positions for Which Current-Year Salaries Are to Be Reported in the Commission's Annual Administrators' Salary Survey*

| University of California | The California State University |
|---|---|
| 1. President | 1. Chancellor |
| 2. Senior Vice President | 2. Provost-Vice Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor |
| 3. Vice President | 3. Deputy Provost |
| 4. Associate Vice President | 4. Vice Chancellor |
| 5. Assistant Vice President | 5. Associate Vice Chancellor |
| 6. General Counsel of the Regents | 6. Assistant Vice Chancellor |
| 7. Deputy General Counsel of the Regents | 7. General Counsel |
| 8. Treasurer of the Regents | 8. Associate General Counsel |
| 9. Associate Treasurer of the Regents | 9. Director of Governmental Affairs |
| 10. Secretary of the Regents | 10. Auditor |
| 11. Director of State Governmental Relations | |
| 12. Auditor | |

sion shall include such comments as it considers appropriate to satisfy the recommendation of the Legislative Analyst contained in the Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80. Comments shall be directed to, but need not be limited by, the contents of the Annual Report on Staffing and Salaries of the Community Colleges' Chancellery.

---

**10. Supplementary information**

Supplementary information shall be supplied annually by both the University of California and the California State University. The University of California shall continue to submit its "Annual Academic Personnel Statistical Report." The California State University shall submit a report to the Commission on faculty demographics, promotions and separations, origins and destinations, and related data. Both the University and the State University will submit their supplemental reports not later than April 1.

---

**11. Criteria for the selection of comparison institutions**

*University of California*

The following four criteria will be used to select comparison institutions for the University:

1. Each institution should be an eminent major university offering a broad spectrum of undergraduate, graduate (Master's and PhD), and professional instruction, and with a faculty responsible for research as well as teaching.

2. Each institution should be one with which the University is in significant and continuing competition in the recruitment and retention of faculty.

3. Each institution should be one from which it is possible to collect salary and benefit cost data on a timely, voluntary, and regular basis. (Not all institutions are willing to provide their salary and benefit cost data, especially in the detail required for comparison purposes.)

4. The comparison group should be composed of both public and private institutions.

   In selecting these institutions, stability over time in the composition of the comparison group is important to enable the development of faculty salary market perspective, time-series analysis, and the contacts necessary for gathering required data.

*The California State University*

The following five criteria will be used to select comparison institutions for the California State University.

1. *General comparability of institutions:* Comparison institutions should reflect the mission, functions, purposes, objectives, and institutional diversity of the California State University system. Faculty expectations at the comparison institutions, in terms of pay, benefits, workload, and professional responsibilities, should be relatively similar to those prevailing at the California State University. To those ends, State University comparison institutions should include those that offer a wide variety of programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels but that grant very few if any doctoral degrees. Specifically, the 20 institutions that awarded the largest number of doctoral degrees during the ten-year period between 1973-74 and 1983-84 should be excluded. The list should include both large and small, and urban and rural institutions from each of the four major regions of the country (Northeast, North Central, South, and West). Approximately one-fourth to one-third of the institutions on the list should be private or independent colleges and universities, and none of these institutions should be staffed predominantly with religious faculty.

2. *Economic comparability of institutional location:* The comparison group, taken as a whole, should reflect a general comparability in living costs and economic welfare to conditions prevailing in California. Consequently, institutions located in very high cost areas, such as New York City, or in severely economically depressed areas, should not be included on the list. In order to ensure a continuing economic comparability between Califor-

nia and those regions in which comparison institutions are located, the Commission will periodically review such economic indicators as it considers appropriate and include the results of its surveys in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefit costs.

3. *Availability of data:* Each institution should be one from which it is possible to collect salary and benefit cost data on a timely, voluntary, and regular basis. (Not all institutions are willing to provide their salary and benefit cost data, especially in the detail required for comparison purposes.)

4. *Fringe benefits:* The comparison institutions should provide fringe benefits, including a retirement program that vests in the faculty member within five years.

5. *University of California comparison institutions:* The California State University's comparison group should not include any institution used by the University of California for its comparison group.

# *Appendix C*

**House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session,**
**Relative to the Economic Welfare of the Faculties**
**of the California Public Institutions of Higher Education**

WHEREAS, The Master Plan for Public Higher Education strongly recommended that every effort be made to ensure that the institutions of higher education in California maintain or improve their position in the intense competition for the highest quality of faculty members; and

WHEREAS, The Coordinating Council for Higher Education in its annual report to the Governor and the Legislature regarding level of support for the California State Colleges and the University of California recommended that funds should be provided to permit at least an additional 5 percent increase in academic salaries for the California State Colleges and the University of California; and

WHEREAS, The Trustees of the California State Colleges in their annual report to the Legislature declared that the California State Colleges are falling far behind in the face of this competition and that by 1964-65 faculty salaries will be lagging 14 to 18 percent behind those of comparable institutions; and

WHEREAS, Greatly increasing enrollments in institutions of higher education in California during the next decade will cause a demand for qualified faculty members which cannot possibly be met unless such institutions have a recruitment climate which will compare favorably with other colleges, universities, and business institutions, industry, and other levels of government; and

WHEREAS, California has achieved an enviable momentum in business and industrial development, a momentum now threatened by lagging faculty salaries so that failure to maintain adequate salary scales for faculty members in California institutions of higher education would be false economy; and

WHEREAS, There have been widespread reports from the State College and University campuses that higher salaries elsewhere are attracting some of the best faculty members from the California institutions of higher education, and if such academic emigration gains momentum because of inadequate salaries, the effect will disrupt the educational processes and result in slower economic growth, followed by lower tax revenues; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has a continuing interest in the difficult and pressing problems faced by the California institutions of higher education in attracting and maintaining outstanding faculty members in a period of stiff competition and rapid growth; and

WHEREAS, The State's investment in superior teaching talent has been reflected in California's phenomenal economic growth and has shown California taxpayers to be the wisest of public investors, but unless the superiority in faculty quality is maintained,

the contributions by the California institutions of higher education to the continued economic and cultural development of California may be seriously threatened; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by Assembly of the State of California*, That the Assembly Committee on Rules is directed to request the Joint Legislative Budget Committee to study the subject of salaries and the general economic welfare, including fringe benefits, of faculty members of the California institutions of higher education, and ways and means of improving such salaries and benefits in order that such California institutions of higher education may be able to compete for the talent necessary to provide the highest quality of education, and to request such committee to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature not later than the fifth legislative day of the 1965 Regular Session.

# *Appendix D*

## A RECOMMENDED METHOD FOR REPORTING TO THE LEGISLATURE ON FACULTY SALARIES AND OTHER BENEFITS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

(Pursuant to HR 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session)

*Prepared by the*
Office of the Legislative Analyst
State of California

January 4, 1965

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 39 |
| Background | 39 |
| Who Should Prepare Faculty Salary Reports | 40 |
| What Faculty Salary Reports Should Contain: | 40 |
| A. Faculty Data | 40 |
| B. Salary Data | 41 |
| C. Fringe Benefits | 42 |
| D. Total Compensation | 42 |
| E. Special Privileges and Benefits | 43 |
| F. Supplementary Income | 43 |

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this staff report is to recommend a method for reporting to the Legislature on salaries, fringe benefits and other special economic benefits for faculties of the University of California and the California State Colleges. This report has been prepared by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee in response to House Resolution 250 (1964 First Extraordinary Session, Appendix 1)[1] which resolved:

> "That the Assembly Committee on Rules is directed to request the Joint Legislative Budget Committee to study the subject of salaries and the general economic welfare, including fringe benefits, of faculty members of the California institutions of higher education, and ways and means of improving such salaries and benefits in order that such California institutions of higher education may be able to compete for the talent necessary to provide the highest quality of education, and to request such committee to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature not later than the fifth legislative day of the 1965 Regular Session."

Staff of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee initiated its study by seeking information which would reflect the magnitude of California's long-range and immediate problems regarding the need to recruit and retain an adequate number of high quality faculty. While reviewing past reports presented to the Legislature as justification for salary increase recommendations by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the University of California and the California State Colleges, it became apparent that the first step in trying to improve faculty salaries and other benefits is to furnish the Legislature with comprehensive and consistent data which identify the nature and level of competitive benefits. The costs associated with recommendations, rated according to priority, should be included in proposals by the segments in order to aid the Legislature in determining how much to appropriate and the benefits which an appropriation will buy.

There has existed in the past a difference between what the institutions have recommended as the need for salary and benefit increases and what has finally been appropriated by the Legislature. There are two principal reasons for this difference which at times may be closely related: (1) The Legislature may disagree with what is proposed as to need, or (2) there may not be enough funds to meet the need because of higher priorities in other areas of the budget.

These needs are very complex and, for example, include such factors as:

1. Disagreement with conclusions drawn from data submitted in justification of recommendations;
2. Lack of confidence in the quantity, quality, or type of data;
3. The failure of advocates to make points which are concise and clearly understandable;
4. The submission of conflicting data by legislative staff or the Department of Finance.

After careful consideration, it was determined that a special report should be made to the Budget Committee containing recommendations as to the kind of data the Legislature should be furnished for the purpose of considering salary and other benefit increases.

On August 5, 1964 a letter (Appendix 2) was sent from the Legislative Analyst to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the University of California, the California State Colleges, the Department of Finance and various faculty organizations informing them that the Joint Legislative Budget Committee was planning to hold a public hearing in connection with HR 250 and asking for replies to a series of questions designed to gather background information about salary and fringe benefits data (Appendix 3, Copies of Replies Received). The primary purpose of the hearing was to provide the University of California, the California State Colleges and interested groups the opportunity to indicate the basis on which salary and fringe benefits should be reported to the Legislature, including the kind of data to be compiled and who should compile and publish it (Appendix 4, Copies of Prepared Testimony Filed with the Joint Legislative Budget Committee at the October 15, 1964 Hearing). The contents of most of the prepared statements discussed problems and in some instances recommendations relating to faculty salaries and other benefits rather than the primary purpose of the hearing, but the testimony did serve to identify areas of concern. The hearing also established legislative interest in the subjects of faculty workload and sources of supplementary income.

The review of past faculty salary reports, the replies to the Legislative Analyst's letter of August 5, 1964, the oral and prepared statements received at the October 15, 1964 hearing of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and other sources have revealed significant findings and permitted the development of recommendations concerning the type of information and method of presentation that should be included in future faculty salary reports prepared for the Legislature.

## BACKGROUND

Current procedures for review of faculty salary and other benefit increase proposals, starting with the presentation of recommendations by state colleges and University of California administrative officials to their respective governing boards, appear generally to be adequate, with minor reservations. The State College Trustees and the Regents of the University of California generally formulate their own proposals in December and forward them to the State Depart-

[1] Appendices deleted.

ment of Finance for budget consideration. Concurrently the Coordinating Council for Higher Education also makes a report with recommendations which is made available to the State Department of Finance. The Governor and the Department of Finance consider these salary increase proposals in relation to the availability of funds and their own analysis of faculty salary needs and decide how much of an increase, if any, to include in the Governor's Budget. The Legislative Analyst in the *Analysis of the Budget Bill* provides analysis and recommendations as to the Governor's budget proposal.

When appropriate legislative committees hear the budget request for faculty salary increases they may be confronted with several recommendations from various sources. Their first responsibility is to consider the Governor's recommendations in the Budget Bill. However, the University and the California State Colleges generally request the opportunity to present their own recommendations, which frequently differ from the Governor's proposal. Also, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education presents its recommendations. Various faculty organizations may desire to make independent proposals. The Legislature has been cooperative in providing all interested parties the opportunity to present their views, but these presentations have been marked by extreme variations in recommendations and in the data which support the requests.

## WHO SHOULD PREPARE FACULTY SALARY REPORTS

There appears to be some difference of opinion concerning the purpose of faculty salary reports and recommendations prepared by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The University of California and the California State Colleges contend that they should make direct recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature and that Coordinating Council recommendations should be regarded as independent comments. Conversely, the Department of Finance and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education believe that salary reports and recommendations of the Coordinating Council should be the primary report submitted to the Department of Finance and the Governor to consider in preparing budget recommendations. The Department of Finance states that such a report should be regarded as similar in status to the annual salary report relating to civil service salaries prepared by the State Personnel Board for the Governor and the Legislature. It is our opinion that the Legislature should give specific and primary consideration to the recommendations in the Governor's Budget and to the annual faculty salary report of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. However, any separate recommendations of the University of California and the California State Colleges should also be considered.

## WHAT FACULTY SALARY REPORTS SHOULD CONTAIN

We do not believe that reporting required of the University, the California State Colleges, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education should limit the right of these agencies to emphasize specific points in supporting their own recommendations. However, the Legislature should take steps to establish a consistent basis upon which it will receive comprehensive information about faculty salaries, other benefits, and related subjects from year to year. After careful consideration of the statistical and other grounds presented in support of salary and other benefit increase proposals in the past, we recommend that basic data be included in faculty salary reports to the Legislature in a consistent form in the following areas:

A. Faculty Data
B. Salary Data
C. Fringe Benefits
D. Total Compensation
E. Special Privileges and Benefits
F. Supplementary Income

Since it is necessary for staff of the executive and legislative branches of government to analyze recommendations prior to the commencement of a legislative session, all reports and recommendations should be completed by December 1 of each year.

### A. Faculty Data

1. Findings
   a. Informative data about the size, composition, retention, and recruitment of California State College faculty has been presented to the Legislature from time to time, but usually it has been so selective that it lacks objectivity and has been inconsistent from year to year.
   b. Superior faculty performance has not been demonstrated as a reason to justify past requests for superior salaries.
2. Recommendations

   The following data should be compiled and presented annually on a consistent basis. Definitions of what constitutes faculty are left to the discretion of the University and the state colleges but should be clearly defined in any report. Additional data may be included in any given year to emphasize special problems, but such data should supplement not replace the basic information recommended below. Graphs should be used when practical, accompanied by supporting tables in an appendix. Recommended faculty data includes:

a. The number of faculty, by rank and the increase over the previous five years to reflect institutional growth.

b. Current faculty composition expressed in meaningful terms, including but not limited to the percentage of the faculty who have PhD's.

c. Student-faculty ratios as a means of expressing performance.

d. Data relating to all new full-time faculty for the current academic year including the number hired, source of employment, their rank and highest degree held. Existing vacancies should also be noted. Pertinent historical trends in these data should be analyzed. We do not believe that subjective and incomplete data estimating reasons for turning down offers, such as has been presented in the past, serves any useful purpose.

e. Faculty turnover rates comparing the number of separations to total faculty according to the following suggested categories; death or retirement, to research or graduate work, intra-institutional transfers, other college or University teaching, business and government, other.

3. Comments

The first three recommendations above are designed to reflect faculty size, composition, rate of growth, and workload. The inclusion of consistent data from year to year will facilitate trend analysis as it relates to the institutions involved and, when possible, to comparable institutions. The purpose of including data on new faculty and faculty turnover is to provide a quantitative base for discussions of problems relating to faculty recruitment and retention. It may also be beneficial to include some basic statistics about the available supply of faculty to see what proportion of the market, new PhD's for example, California institutions hire every year.

B. Salary Data

1. Findings

a. The University for several years has exchanged salary data to provide a consistent comparison with a special group of five "eminent" universities, as well as with a group of nine public universities. Conversely, the California State Colleges have not yet established a list of comparable institutions which is acceptable to them.

b. Both the University of California and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education maintain that salary comparisons to appropriate institutions is the best single method of determining salary needs.

c. The University of California places less significance on salary comparisons with non-academic employment than the Coordinating Council on Higher Education and the California State Colleges.

d. Salary increases have been proposed on the basis of differentials between total compensation (salaries plus fringe benefits) in comparable institutions.

e. Both the University and the California State Colleges have tended to relate the size of proposed salary increases to how much of an increase would be necessary to return to a specific competitive position which existed in 1957-58 and which was unusually advantageous.

f. Salary comparisons have frequently been made to various levels of teaching including elementary, high school, and junior college salaries.

g. Methods of salary comparisons with other institutions have varied from year to year in reports prepared by the state colleges.

2. Recommendations

a. We recommend that proposed faculty salary increases distinguish between: (1) increases necessary to maintain the current competitive position and (2) increases to improve the current competitive position.

(1) Proposed increases to maintain the existing competitive position should be equivalent to a projection of the average salary relationship between the University, or state colleges, and comparable institutions during the current fiscal year to the next fiscal year. We recommend that this projection be based on a projection of actual salary increases by rank in comparable institutions during the past five years, permitting statistical adjustments for unusual circumstances. Thus the proposed increase to maintain the existing competitive position would, in effect, be equal to the average of annual salary increases in comparable institutions during the past five years. A record of the accuracy of projections should be maintained in an appendix.

(2) Recommendations to improve the current competitive positions should be related to the additional advantages to be derived.

b. It is also recommended that the California State College Trustees select a list of com-

parable institutions within the next year and that agreements be negotiated to exchange salary data in a form which will facilitate comparisons. A list of the criteria used to select comparable institutions, plus characteristics of the institutions selected, should be included in next year's report.

c. Specific proposals for salary increases should be accompanied by comparisons of current salary amounts and historic trends to comparable institutions. The following general principles are considered to be important:

(1) Salary data should be separated from fringe benefit and special benefit data for purposes of reporting salary comparisons.

(2) A consistent form should be used from year to year to present salary data. A suggested form might be to illustrate a five-year historic trend in average salaries by using a line graph for each rank. An alternative might be a table which simply shows where California ranked among comparable institutions during the past five years.

The current salary position might best be illustrated by showing a list of average salaries of the California institutions and the other comparable institutions from the highest to the lowest average, by rank, for the last actual and current years. This will show the relative position of the California institution for the last actual and current years, as well as the range of averages. Frequency distributions of faculty by rank or professor should be incorporated in an appendix and any significant limitations in the use of averages between those particular institutions in a given year should be noted. For example, an unusual proportion of faculty in the high ranks or the low ranks would affect the comparability of the arithmetic means.

(3) Special data to illustrate a particular problem in any given year would be appropriate as long as it supplements, rather than replaces, basic salary data.

d. Finally, it is recommended that salary data be reported in a form by rank which compensates for differences in faculty distributions.

C. Fringe Benefits

1. Findings

a. The definition of fringe benefits generally includes benefits available to all faculty that have a dollar cost to the employer. Benefits and services in kind are considered to be fringe benefits only if a cash payment option is available. Retirement and health insurance, by definition, are the only two programs considered as fringe benefits by the University of California and the California State Colleges.

b. Comparisons of fringe benefits, when comparisons have been made at all, have generally been limited to the dollar contribution by the employer and have not included any analysis of the quality of the benefits to the employee.

2. Recommendations

a. It is recommended that fringe benefit comparisons of type of benefit be included in faculty salary reports, but compared separately from salaries. Such comparisons should include an analysis of the quality of the benefits as well as the dollar cost to the employer.

b. Proposals to increase specific fringe benefits should be made separately from salaries, including separate cost estimates.

3. Comments

Separate proposals for increases in salaries and fringe benefits should be made to minimize misunderstanding about competitive positions. For example, information submitted to the 1963 Legislature by the University of California, in support of a proposed salary increase for 1963–64, compared total compensation data (salaries plus fringe benefits) rather than salaries alone. This report stated in part: "In comparing salaries, fringe benefits must be taken into account. Salary comparisons between the University and other institutions based on salary *alone* look far more favorable than comparisons of salaries *plus benefits.*" The least favorable comparison was with fringe benefits, not salaries, thus the report recommended a salary increase largely on the basis of a difference in fringe benefits. Although it is felt that comparisons of total compensation are appropriate inclusions in a faculty salary report, such data should only be in addition to rather than in place of separate analyses of the current competitive position in salaries and fringe benefits.

D. Total Compensation

1. Findings

a. Total compensation data consists of average salaries plus a dollar amount representing the employer's cost of fringe benefits.

b. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the University of California and the California State Colleges have in the past all

used total compensation data prepared and published by the American Association of University Professors in their respective faculty salary reports.

2. Recommendations

We recommend that total compensation data, as reported by the American Association of University Professors, be included in faculty salary reports as a supplement to separate salary and fringe benefit information.

E. Special Privileges and Benefits

1. Findings

There are other faculty privileges and economic benefits which are not classified as fringe benefits because they may not be available to all faculty or fit the definition of a fringe benefit in some other respect. Examples at the University of California include up to one-half the cost of moving expenses, vacations for 11-month appointees, the waiving of nonresident tuition for faculty children, sabbatical leaves with pay, and other special and sick leaves with or without pay.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that a list of special privileges and benefits be defined and summaries of related policies be included in a special section in future faculty salary reports so that the Legislature will be aware of what these privileges and benefits include.

3. Comments

The expansion or establishment of some of these special privileges and benefits could improve recruiting success more than the expenditure of comparable amounts in salaries. For example, moving expenses are not currently offered by the state colleges but some allowance might make the difference of whether a young candidate from the East could accept an appointment. If this type of benefit is proposed, it must include adequate controls.

F. Supplementary Income

1. Findings

a. The multiple loyalties created by permitting faculty to supplement their salaries by earning extra income from various sources within and outside his college or University is recognized as a problem common to institutions of higher education throughout the United States.

b. There apparently are proportionately more private consulting opportunities in California than in other areas of the nation. For example, 51 percent of the federal research defense contracts were concentrated in California during 1963–64.

c. The University of California has general policies designed to insure that outside activities do not interfere with University responsibilities. If outside activities interfere with University responsibilities, the faculty member generally must take a leave of absence without pay until such outside activities are completed. These and other related University policies were praised in a 1956 Carnegie-financed study titled *University Faculty Compensation Policies and Practices.*

d. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education submitted excerpts from nationwide studies relating to the magnitude of outside activities. We have no way of determining how the data may relate to California, but if the figures are reasonable, then it appears that probably a large percentage of faculty have at least one source of extra income. Sources of income were reported are follows:

| *Source* | *Percent of faculty earning additional income from source* |
|---|---|
| Lecturing | 31% |
| General writing | 28 |
| Summer and extension teaching | 25 |
| Government consulting | 15 |
| Textbook writing | 14 |
| Private consulting | 12 |
| Public service and foundation consulting | 9 |
| Other professional activities | 13 |

*Source: University Faculty Compensation Policies and Practices in the U. S.*, Association of American Universities, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1964.

e. The United State Office of Education has just completed a nationwide sample survey of outside earnings of college faculty for 1961–62. Although data has not been published yet, special permission has been received to report the following results which are quoted from a letter sent to the Legislative Analyst on December 4, 1964 from the staff of the California State College Trustees:

**OUTSIDE EARNINGS OF TEACHING FACULTY ON ACADEMIC YEAR CONTRACTS (9–10 MONTHS)**

The U. S. Office of Education has just completed a nationwide survey of outside earnings by a sampling of all college faculty nationwide for 1961–62. The results are as follows:

| | Percent | Average earnings |
|---|---|---|
| All with outside earnings | 74 | $2,200 |
| Summer teaching | 44 | 1,300 |
| Other summer employment | 11 | 1,800 |
| Other teaching | 13 | 900 |
| Royalties | 8 | 1,200 |
| Speeches | 9 | 200 |
| Consultant fees | 13 | 1,400 |
| Retirement (individuals who have retired who teach elsewhere after retiring) | 1 | 3,400 |
| Research | 7 | 1,800 |
| Other professional earnings | 10 | 1,200 |
| Non-professional earnings | 8 | 1,700 |

The highest average earnings by teaching field and the percentage with outside earnings are:

| | Percent | Average earnings |
|---|---|---|
| Law (which we do not have) | 78 | $3,300 |
| Engineering | 82 | 3,200 |
| Business and Commerce | 78 | 2,900 |
| Physical Sciences | 80 | 2,900 |
| Agriculture | 71 | 2,800 |
| Psychology | 85 | 2,700 |

In light of the Joint Committee discussion you might be interested in the following:

| | Percent | Average earnings |
|---|---|---|
| Social Sciences | 74 | $1,900 |
| Fine Arts | 74 | 1,800 |
| Philosophy | 74 | 1,500 |
| Religion and Theology | 75 | 1,200 |

2. Recommendations

a. We recommend that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the University of California and the California State Colleges cooperate in determining the extent to which faculty members participate in extra activities to supplement their nine-month salaries including information as to when extra activities are usually performed (such as vacations, etc.). Such activities would include, but not be limited to, lecturing, general writing, summer and extension teaching, government consulting, textbook writing, private consulting, public service and foundation consulting, and other professional activities. If such a study suggests that the magnitude of these activities is such that the performance of normal University and state college responsibilities are perhaps being adversely affected, then consideration should be given to the possibility of maintaining more complete and meaningful records. Such records would aid administrative officials and academic senates when reviewing recommendations for promotions and salary increases and provide summary data for reporting to the Legislature on these significant faculty welfare items. Next year's faculty salary report of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education should incorporate the results of this study.

b. We also recommend that existing state college policies and enforcement practices regarding extra employment be reviewed and updated.

c. Finally, it is recommended that faculty salary reports keep the Legislature informed about policies and practices relating to extra employment.

3. Comments

In our opinion, it would seem that any extra employment would affect the quality of performance of University responsibilities since faculty surveys indicate that the average faculty workweek is 54 hours. The time spent on activities for extra compensation (except during the summer) would be on top of what the faculty has defined as their average workweek. Because, in some instances, it is difficult to determine whether a given income-producing activity, such as writing a book, is considered a normal University responsibility or an extra activity, distinctions between normal and extra activities need to be more clearly defined.

Much of the outside compensation received by faculty comes in the form of grants made directly to the faculty member rather than through the University or colleges. There is no regular reporting of these grants or the personal compensation which they provide to faculty, and the colleges and University do not consider the reporting of such income to be feasible. It may be desirable to encourage the Congress to direct that greater number of grants made by United States agencies for research be made directly to academic institutions.

# *Appendix E*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DAVID PIERPONT GARDNER
President

December 9, 1988

Kenneth O'Brien, Acting Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ken:

As I discussed with you recently, I am forwarding an updated report of the annual University of California faculty salary comparison report. The University of Michigan called us yesterday morning to give us their data. We now have data from all eight institutions, and the final figure for the University of California faculty salary increase is 4.7 percent.

If you have any questions concerning these tables, please contact Director Switkes at (415) 643-6512.

Sincerely,

Calvin C. Moore
Associate Vice President
Academic Affairs

Attachments

cc: President Gardner
Senior Vice President Frazer
Senior Vice President Brady
Vice President Baker
Assistant Vice President Hershman
Director Arditti
Director Justus
Director Switkes
Director of Finance Huff
Legislative Analyst Hill
Mr. Harold E. Geiogue
Mr. Robert L. Harris
Mr. Stan Lena
Mr. Stuart Marshall

42

12/6/88

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1988-89

TABLE 1

Projected Difference in Faculty Salaries: UC and Comparison Institutions
(Excludes Health Sciences and Law)

| | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor | Average[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comparison 8 Institutions[1]: | | | | |
| Average Salaries 1988-89 | $67,474 | $46,201 | $38,185 | |
| Average Salaries 1983-84 | 49,739 | 33,500 | 27,047 | |
| Projected Average 1989-90[3] | 71,717 | 49,269 | 40,912 | 62,262 |
| University of California: | | | | |
| Average Salaries 1988-89[4] | 68,932 | 45,240 | 39,559 | 59,469 |
| Projected Staffing 1989-90 | 3,457 | 1,055 | 889 | Total 5,401 |
| Percentage Increase Needed to adjust UC 1989-90 salaries to equal the projected 1989-90 comparison average salaries | 4.0% | 8.9% | 3.4% | 4.7% |

[1]Comparison institutions: Harvard University, University of Illinois, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), Stanford University, University of Virginia, Yale University, and SUNY-Buffalo. Computed from confidential data received from these comparison institutions.

[2]Averages based on projected 1989-90 UC staffing pattern.

[3]Compound annual growth rate over the five-year period is used for the one year projection.

[4]1988-89 average salaries adjusted to include 3% increase effective 6/1/89 and merits and promotions to be effective 7/1/89.

12/6/88

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1988-89

TABLE II

Average Comparison Institution Salaries

| Institution | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1988-89 | | |
| A | $74,383 | $52,800 | $41,397 |
| B | 64,560 | 44,395 | 35,592 |
| C | 65,050 | 46,526 | 37,014 |
| D | 70,608 | 43,137 | 34,890 |
| E | 61,572 | 46,985 | 39,326 |
| F | 69,675 | 51,349 | 41,632 |
| G | 56,671 | 40,236 | 35,632 |
| H | 77,269 | 44,179 | 40,000 |
| Average | $67,474 | $46,201 | $38,185 |
| | 1983-84 | | |
| A | $54,101 | $37,585 | $29,657 |
| B | 45,600 | 30,900 | 23,400 |
| C | 48,593 | 34,407 | 27,020 |
| D | 52,101 | 31,888 | 25,066 |
| E | 43,696 | 32,509 | 27,050 |
| F | 52,100 | 36,900 | 29,300 |
| G | 43,912 | 30,660 | 27,112 |
| H | 57,806 | 33,150 | 27,767 |
| Average | $49,739 | $33,500 | $27,047 |

Confidential data received from comparison institutions include 9- and 11-month full-time salaries for all schools and colleges except health sciences and law.

# *Appendix F*

Note: The data appearing in the tables in this appendix include estimates for nine State University comparison institutions, reflecting information received on December 5, 1988. The data in Displays 6 and 7 on pages 12 and 14 above, however, include final data for all 20 State University comparison institutions.

December 5, 1988

Mr. Murray J. Haberman
Postsecondary Education Specialist
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Murray:

This letter is to report to the Postsecondary Education Commission the information that we have developed for the 1989-90 State budget cycle regarding faculty salaries in the California State University and the 20 universities designated as comparison institutions. When considered in accordance with the methodology established by the Commission, these data indicate a salary lag in the next fiscal year of 4.8%.

Five tables summarize the information developed:

Attachment A presents data on the distribution of CSU full-time, instructional faculty by rank and their average salaries during the current year. As you know, CSU salaries will likely be raised very late in the academic year (June 1, 1989), consequently three sets of averages are shown: salaries as of Fall 1988, average salaries over the academic year (based on 9 months paid at current levels and 3 months at salaries 4.7% higher), and "final" salaries reflecting the full 4.7% increase.

As we have discussed previously, we believe that CSU academic year average salaries should be used for current year comparisons, while "final" salaries should only be used for lag calculations into the next budget year. Otherwise, the impression is created that CSU Asisstant and Associate Professors earn more than faculty in the comparison group. That is contrary to the facts at hand.

The second table (Attachment B) shows the distribution by rank and the average salary in 1988-89 of faculty in the 20 comparison institutions. It is based on current year reports from 11 institutions and estimates from prior year data for 9 institutions. These estimates were made, of course, in accordance with the prescribed methodology; they rely on the planned or expected increases at each of the institutions involved.

The third table (attachment C) shows the distribution by rank and the average salary in 1983-84 of faculty in the comparison institutions.

Attachment D, based on the prior attachments B and C, presents the projections into the 1989-90 budget year of the comparison average salary at each rank.

The fifth and final table (attachment E) presents the lag calculations using the data in the preceding 4 tables.

The detailed information that substantiate the comparison institution salary averages in 1983 and 1988 were recently mailed to you. New data that we receive from campuses for whom current year estimates were made will be forwarded promptly.

Please advise if you have any questions regarding the information transmitted herewith or with the materials forwarded earlier.

Sincerely,

Thierry F. Koenig
Faculty and Staff Relations

5 Enclosures

cc: Dr. O'Brien
Dr. Naples
Dr. Smart
Mr. Harris
Mr. Geiogue
Mr. Worthman

The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

Attachment A

## Number of Full-time Faculty and Average Salaries By Rank in the California State University 1988-89

| | Number of Faculty | Average Salaries | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 1988 | Academic Year Average | Final Salaries |
| PROFESSOR | 7,376 | $52,657 | $53,275 | $55,132 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 2,378 | 41,201 | 41,685 | 43,137 |
| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | 1,720 | 33,379 | 33,771 | 34,947 |
| INSTRUCTOR | 229 | 27,836 | 28,164 | 29,145 |
| TOTAL | 11,703 | $47,010 | $47,562 | $49,219 |

Note: Academic year average salaries are estimated at 1.175% above Fall 1988 salaries. Final salaries assume implementation on June 1, 1989 of a 4.7% increase.

November 15, 1988

The California State University
Office of the chancellor

Attachment B

Number of Full-time Faculty and
Average Salaries by Rank
in the
20 Comparison Institutions
1988-89

| | No. of Faculty | Average Salary |
|---|---|---|
| PROFESSOR | 4,228 | $55,910 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 4,374 | 41,534 |
| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | 3,069 | 34,693 |
| INSTRUCTOR | 372 | 26,902 |
| TOTAL | 12,043 | $44,386 |

Based on 11 institutions reporting current year data and projections from prior year data for 9 institutions.

December 5, 1988

The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

Attachment C

## Number of Full-time Faculty and Average Salary By Rank in the 20 Comparison Institutions 1983-84

| | Number of Faculty | Average Salary |
|---|---|---|
| PROFESSOR | 3,948 | $41,443 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 4,102 | 30,887 |
| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | 3,192 | 25,073 |
| INSTRUCTOR | 479 | 19,990 |
| TOTAL | 11,721 | $32,414 |

December 5, 1988

The California State University
Office of the chancellor

Attachment D

Projections of Comparison Institutions
Average Salaries into 1989-90

| | 5-yr. Trend | 1988-89 Average | 1989-90 Projection |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROFESSOR | 6.17 | 55,910 | 59,360 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 6.10 | 41,534 | 44,069 |
| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | 6.71 | 34,693 | 37,021 |
| INSTRUCTOR | 6.12 | 26,902 | 28,548 |

December 5, 1988

The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

Attachment E

## Estimate of CSU Faculty Salary Lag in 1989-90 With the 20 Comparison Institutions

| | CSU Final 1988-89 Salaries | Comp. Inst. 1989-90 Projection | CSU Lag |
|---|---|---|---|
| CSU Staffing Pattern | $49,219 | $52,367 | 6.40% |
| Comp. Inst. Staffing | 44,829 | 47,161 | 5.20% |
| Average of two computations | $47,024 | $49,764 | 5.83% |
| Adjustments: | Law faculty | | 0.20% |
| | CSU growth | | 0.20% |
| | CSU Merit awards | | 0.64% |
| CSU Net Lag in 1989-90. . . . . | | | 4.79% |

December 5, 1988

# *References*


California Postsecondary Education Commission: *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs*. Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985.

--. *Faculty Salary Revisions: A Review of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefits*. Commission Report 87-27. Sacramento: The Commission June 1987.--.

*Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation*. Commission Report 87-36. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Changes in Faculty Salary Methodology*. Commission Agenda Item, February 8, 1988.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51*. Commission Report 88-9. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988.

# CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

**Members of the Commission**

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of April 1989, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach;
Henry Der, San Francisco;
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco;
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach;
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Vice Chair;*
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles;
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto; *Chair;* and
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto.

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California;

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University;

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions;

Francis Laufenberg, Orange; appointed by the California State Board of Education; and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities.

**Functions of the Commission**

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

**Operation of the Commission**

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

# FACULTY SALARIES IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, 1989-90

## California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 89-11

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

**88-43** Education Needs of California Firms for Trade in Pacific Rim Markets: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

**88-44** Progress on the Development of a Policy for Revenue Collected by the California State University Through Concurrent Enrollment: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act (December 1988)

**88-45** Prepaid College Tuition and Savings Bond Programs: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

**89-1** Legislative Priorities for the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1989)

**89-2** The Twentieth Campus: An Analysis of the California State University's Proposal to Establish a Full-Service Campus in the City of San Marcos in Northern San Diego County (January 1989)

**89-3** Toward Educational Equity: Progress in Implementing the Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 of 1984: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 574, Statutes of 1987) (January 1989)

**89-4** The Effectiveness of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program's Administrative and Policy-Making Processes: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (1985) (January 1989)

**89-5** Comments on the Community Colleges' Study of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language to the 1988 State Budget Act (January 1989)

**89-6** Prospects for Accommodating Growth in Postsecondary Education to 2005: Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, January 23, 1989 (January 1989)

**89-7** State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

**89-8** Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1989: The Second in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (March 1989)

**89-9** A Further Review of the California State University's Contra Costa Center (March 1989)

**89-10** Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity: A Needs Assessment of Educational Services for Eligible Legalized Aliens in California Under the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant Program of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 23, 1989, by California Tomorrow (March 1989)

**89-11** Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1989)

**89-12** Teacher Preparation Programs Offered by California's Public Universities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 State Budget Act (March 1989)

**89-13** The State's Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 78 (Resolution Chapter 22, 1988) (March 1989)

**89-14** Analysis of the 1989-90 Governor's Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

**89-15** Planning Our Future: A Staff Background Paper on Long-Range Enrollment and Facilities Planning in California Public Higher Education (April 1989)

**89-16** Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1988: The Fourth in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (April 1989)

**89-17** Protecting the Integrity of California Degrees: The Role of California's Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977 in Educational Quality Control (April 1989)